

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

IERCE X

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION N	10.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/846,637 04/30/2001		04/30/2001	Michael C. Jensen	24751-2502	4845
34055	7590	05/05/2005		EXAMINER	
PERKIN			PAK, YONG D		
POST OFFICE BOX 1208 SEATTLE, WA 98111-1208				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
<b>4</b>	<b>_,</b>			1652	
				DATE MAILED: 05/05/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/846,637	JENSEN, MICHAEL C		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Yong D. Pak	1652		

		Yong D. Pak	1652	
-,.,	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REP	LY FILED 29 March 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
this plac (3)	reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or of application, applicant must timely file one of the followers the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notal Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compositing time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, a otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	affidavit, or other evidence compliance with 37 C	ence, which CFR 41.31; or
a) 🔲	The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of	late of the final rejection.		
·	The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverse, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the control	of the final rejection. IRST REPLY WAS FILEI	OWTHIN TWO
been filed is CFR 1.17(a above, if ch earned pate	of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on some the date for purposes of determining the period of extension as a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened states are calculated from: (2) the expiration date of the shortened states are calculated from: (3) the expiration date of the shortened states are calculated from: (4) the calculated from: (5) the calculated from: (5) the calculated from: (5) the calculated from: (6) the calculated from: (7) the date on a state of the calculated from: (7) the date on a state of the calculated from: (8) the calculated from: (9) the calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened state of the calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened state of the calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened state of the calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened state of the calculated from: (1) the	and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2)	n fee under 37 as set forth in (b)
2. The	Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any elements a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be	xtension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)	), to avoid dismissal o	of the appeal.
	e proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brie	ef, will not be entered I	pecause
(a)[ (b)[	They raise new issues that would require further co They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo They are not deemed to place the application in bei appeal; and/or	nsideration and/or search (see NC ow);	TE below);	
(d)[	They present additional claims without canceling a		ejected claims.	
⊿ 🗀 ть.	NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL_324)
	e amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 plicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s		omphant Amendment	(FTOL-324).
6. 🗌 Ne	wly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).	•	e, timely filed amendm	ent canceling
how The Clai Clai Clai	purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) the new or amended claims would be rejected is prostatus of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: m(s) allowed: m(s) objected to: m(s) rejected: m(s) withdrawn from consideration:		vill be entered and an	explanation of
	IT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
bec	e affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be ause applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
ente sho	e affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing ered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to desire a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessare.	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under apperty and was not earlier presented.	eal and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(	ils to provide a 1).
	e affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the consideration of the consider	on of the status of the claims after	entry is below or attac	ched.
11. 🛛 Th	e request for reconsideration has been considered bue attached.	ut does NOT place the application	in condition for allowa	nce because:
	te the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)	•
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			

Application/Control Number: 09/846,637

Art Unit: 1652

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

The amendment filed on March 29, 2005 under 37 CFR 1.116 in reply to the final rejection has been considered but is not deemed to place the application in condition for allowance and will not be entered because: the arguments presented does not overcome the rejection under 103(a).

Claims 73-74, 142-143, 219-220, 234-235 and 248-249 are pending and are under consideration.

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on March 29, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 73-74, 142-143, 219-220, 234-235 and 248-249 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farazi et al. in view of Lightfoot et al. and Roelant et al.

Applicants argue that there is no motivation to combine the cited references. Examiner respectfully disagrees. The motivation of combining the references is to make mutants of IMPDH that are resistant to IMPDH inhibitors which is taught in the reference of Lightfoot et al. Lightfoot et al. discloses a mutant mouse IMPDH having resistance to MPA, an IMPDH inhibitor. The mutant IMPDH of Lightfoot et al. has two

**Art Unit: 1652** 

point mutations, Thr-333-lle and Ser-351-Tyr which corresponds to residues Thr-333 and Ser-351 of human IMPDH type II of the instant invention.

Applicants also argue that the references do not teach each and every element of the claimed invention, such as introduction of a nucleic acid encoding an altered human IMPDH into a eukaryotic cell, and the reference of Farazi et al. and Lightfoot do not teach this element. While this is true, Roelant et al., the third reference in the rejection, discloses this element. Roelant et al. discloses a method of performing proliferation assay by quantifying the number of viable cells which contains heterologous polynucleotides.

Hence the rejection is maintained.

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yong Pak whose telephone number is 571-272-0935. The examiner can normally be reached 6:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ponnathapu Achutamurthy can be reached on 571-272-0928. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications and 703-872-9307 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-1600.

Yong D. Pak Patent Examiner PONNATHAPU ACHURAMURTHY SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600